

REMARKS

Applicant, by the amendments presented above, has made a concerted effort to present claims which more clearly define over the prior art of record, and thus to place this case in condition for allowance.

Currently, claims 1-24 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite "said front link arm" and "said rear link arm". Applicant asserts that sufficient antecedent basis is provided for these limitations. Claim 12 has been amended to recite "a bearing mounted proximate each end of said front shaft" and "a bearing mounted proximate each end of said rear shaft". Applicant asserts that the claim is now clear as to how many bearings are being claimed.

Applicant requests that the objections with regard to claims 10-13 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 2,170,454 to Larison.

Claim 1 as amended now recites:

An isolator to be used in a suspension system for vehicle having generally parallel first and second axles, the isolator comprising:
a front shaft **parallel to said first and second axles** of the vehicle,
a rear shaft **parallel to said first and second axles** of the vehicle. . .

Larison discloses an intervention for use with heavy-duty trucks and trailers in which a plurality of wheels are provided in pairs to obtain greater load-carrying efficiency. The arrangement of the assemblies relative to the pairs of wheels is shown in FIG. 1 and described on page 2, column 1,

lines 20-55. The wheels A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H are arranged in pairs. The pairs of wheels A-B and C-D are provided at the front of the vehicle, whereas the pairs of wheels E-F and G-H are provided at the rear of the vehicle. Thus, as shown in FIG. 1, wheel A is positioned to the left of the vehicle and wheel B is positioned to the right of wheel A. As described at page 2, column 2, lines 23-40, a rocker 19 is provided between each pair of wheels. The rocker provides equalization of the movements between wheels A and B, i.e. in a left to right direction.

In contrast, Applicant's invention provides equalization of the forces between the front and rear axles of the vehicle. This equalization of forces in the front and rear direction is accomplished through the rotation of the front and rear shafts 80, 82 which as specified in amended claim 1, are parallel to the vehicles axles. Larison does not disclose an isolator having front and rear shafts parallel to the first and second vehicle axis, therefore claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Larison.

Claim 2-4, 6-8 and 12 depend from claim 1. Applicant asserts that because claim 1 is allowable, claims 2-4, 6-8 and 12 are also allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Larison in view of United States Patent No. 4,676,523 to Rogers.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant asserts that claim 1 as amended is allowable. Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Applicant asserts that because claim 1 is allowable, claim 5 is also allowable. Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 5.

Newly Added Claim

Claim 25 has been added in this amendment. The cited art does not disclose an isolator include rotating front and rear shafts which cause expansion or contraction of a resilient member. Because claim 25 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited art, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of claim 25.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-24 were found to be allowable.

Claims 9 and 14 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Claims 9 and 14 have been rewritten in independent form to include each of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claim. Thus, Applicant request allowance of claims 9 and 14.

Applicant notes that the Examiner included claim 9 in his rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 but also included claim 9 in the allowable subject matter. Applicant has rewritten claim 9 in independent form and asserts that claim 9 as presented is allowable.

A one-month extension of time is filed in connection with this amendment extending the deadline for responding to the Office Action to October 11, 2005, as October 10, 2005 was a holiday.

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections of the Examiner. Should the

Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact one of the undersigned attorneys at (312) 704-1890.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/11/05

By: Paige A. Kitzinger
Richard A. Gianglori, Reg. No. 24,284
Linda L. Palomar, Reg. No. 37,903
Paige A. Kitzinger, Reg. No. 45,219
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.
105 W. Adams Street
Suite 3600
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 704-1890

871001.WPD